

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/628,569	07/31/2000	Jeff Haber	31026-04910	4143	
7	590 03/26/2004		EXAMINER		
John R Carr 118 S Clark Dr			RUDY, ANDREW J		
Los Angeles, (ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3627		
			DATE MAILED: 03/26/200	DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/628,569	HABER, JEFF				
,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Andrew Joseph Rudy	3627				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover she t with the co	orrespondenc add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 19 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment						
canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NC	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec		to issues which we	ere newly			
raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen						
10. Other:						

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/628,569

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's counsel have misrepresented th contents of the "interview" conducted on or about March 18, 2004. First, the Examiner was clear in stating after the call was received by counsel that the present Application was not in front of the Examiner at the time the conversation was consumated. No request was made by Applicant's counsel to retrieve the Application to further discuss the merits of the present Application. Thus, it would appear reasonable that the Examiner not affirmatively state facts that were not vivid in ones mind. Second, from page 3, paragraphs 2 & 3 from the 3/19/04 Response, were not acknowledged by the Examiner during the conversation. Third, from page 5, first full paragraph, of the present response, Applicant is correct that the word "contiguous" taken in context with the other claim language, e.g. claim 16, line 5, "each image in the series corresponding" does not presently provide a line of demarcation, i.e. does not provide patentable claim language, over the art of record. Also, from page 5, first full paragraph, it is not clearwhere "the exact claim language" Applicant references comes from. It is assumed it comes from claim 16 as such language does reside in claim 16. Nonetheless, this claim language does not distinguish over the prior art of record.